

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated December 26, 2006. Claims 6, 21, 27 and 31 are pending.

Claim 6 stands rejected under Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over alleged Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Inaba and Armezzani. This is a new ground of rejection. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action appears to contend that alleged APA Fig. 6 is the base reference of the Section 103(a) rejection. Apparently recognizing the flaws in the APA, the Office Action makes two modifications to APA Fig. 6. First, the Office Action contends that it would have been obvious to have made films 114 in APA Fig. 6 of polymer, citing to Inaba. Second, the Office Action contends that it would have been obvious to have made the insulating protecting film 114 on the side of the terminal in APA Fig. 6 "thinner" than the insulating substrate 111. To support this second modification, the Examiner cites to solder masks 5 in Armezzani (col. 4, lines 25-20, and col. 5, lines 15-20). At least this latter/second modification to APA Fig. 6 is *incorrect* and legally flawed.

In particular, Armezzani uses solder masks 5 only because of subsequent solder to be applied to the product (e.g., col. 5, lines 4-10). Because APA Fig. 6 does not teach that subsequent solder is to be applied to the product, there is no reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have used the solder mask of Armezzani in place of or in addition to film 114 in APA Fig. 6. Accordingly, there is no motivation or suggestion in the cited art to replace or supplement film 114 in APA Fig. 6 with the solder mask of Armezzani. Furthermore, there is no reason in the art of record why one of ordinary skill would have wanted to "reduce the thickness"

KAWAI et al.
Appl. No. 09/712,227
March 1, 2007

of the board 110 in APA Fig. 6, so that this alleged motivation is also flawed. Hindsight is not permissible. The Section 103(a) rejection of claim 6 is incorrect and should be withdrawn.


The Section 103(a) rejection of claim 21 is flawed in a similar manner, and should also be withdrawn.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100